

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 994

UD 010 496

AUTHOR Frankel, Edward
TITLE Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment of the Four Year Comprehensive High School. 1967-1968 Follow-up Study. Project No. 2588. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City, 1967-68.

INSTITUTION Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.

SPONS AGENCY New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.

PUB DATE Nov 68

NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.50

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes, Counselor Attitudes, *Disadvantaged Youth, Ethnic Grouping, *Followup Studies, *Grade Organization, *High Schools, Integration Effects, Interviews, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, School Attitudes, Special Services, Student Attitudes, Teacher Attitudes, Transfer Students

IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City


ABSTRACT

This report is a follow-up study of the students who participated in a high school grade reorganization plan in the city of New York as a step toward establishment of a four-year comprehensive high school. The evaluation attempts assessment of any long-range effects of this program on disadvantaged high school students in four representative high schools. The study focuses on the effect, if any, that the student transfer program had on academic achievement, drop-out rate, and attitude toward school of these disadvantaged youth. Study data were collected by conferences with principals and administrators, and also by gathering information on the ethnic census of the school, integration efforts, special services, student attendance, lateness, and truancy for two samples--1965 grade 9 entrants and 1966 grade 10 entrants. Questionnaires were administered to guidance counselors and classroom teachers. Recommendations include the need to both intensify and extend existing services, the need for intensive studies of the total range of remedial and compensatory programs, and the accompaniment of organization changes (such as the grade 9 transfer programs) by massive and sustained infusion of other services including remediation, guidance, teacher training, and the like. (RJ)

ED041994

A 080

**Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1967-68**



Project No. 2568

**FOLLOW UP STUDY
OF COMPREHENSIVE
HIGH SCHOOLS**


UD010496

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by Edward Frankel

November 1968

The Center for Urban Education



ED041994

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

GRADE REORGANIZATION PREPARATORY TO THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF THE FOUR YEAR COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL
1967-68 FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Edward Frankel

Evaluation of a New York City school district
educational project funded under Title I of
the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of
1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with
the Board of Education of the City of New York
for the 1967-68 school year.

UD010496

Educational Research Committee

December 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	
I. Project Description	1
Introduction	1
Objectives of the Study	2
Populations in the Study	3
Design of the Study	3
II. Procedures	4
Population Samples	4
Academic Performance	5
Holding Power of the Schools	5
Characteristics of Stayins	6
III. Findings	8
Responses of Principals	8
Academic Performance	10
Holding Power of the Schools	15
Characteristics of Stayins	18
IV. Summary and Conclusions	22
Summary of Findings	22
Conclusions	25
Recommendations	26
Appendix A: Tables	A1
Appendix B: Instruments	B1
Appendix C: School Profiles	C1
Appendix D: Staff List	D1

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the third consecutive evaluation of the high school grade reorganization plan as it operated in four high schools during the school year 1967-68.

Although the plans for establishing the four-year comprehensive high school have been set aside for the time being and the ninth-grade transfer plan has been "frozen" and there were no Title I funds for implementing or evaluating the plan, the current study was made possible as the result of a modest grant made by the Board of Education. It was largely through the interest and efforts of Dr. Nathan Brown, Executive Deputy Superintendent, and the support it received from Dr. Jacob Landers, Assistant Superintendent, that this study came into being. The evaluation design was developed with the assistance and cooperation of Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent and Dr. Samuel B. McClelland, Acting Director of the Bureau of Educational Research. The contribution of these people is gratefully acknowledged.

The collection of data was made possible through the complete cooperation of the professional personnel of the four high schools participating in this study. The principals and their administrative guidance and teaching staffs were most generous in granting interviews, arranging for student interviews, completing questionnaires, and making school records available as well as providing information whenever requested up until the last week in June 1968.

Dr. Perry Kalick, Assistant Evaluation Director, gave invaluable help throughout every phase of this study.

CHAPTER I

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

This report is a follow-up study of the students who had participated in a high-school grade reorganization plan introduced in the New York City schools in September 1965 as a step toward the establishment of the Four Year Comprehensive High School. The current evaluation attempted to assess any long-range effects of this program on participating disadvantaged high school students in four representative high schools, three years later during the 1967-68 school year.

In an endeavor to achieve quality integrated education and better ethnic distribution in the high schools of New York City, starting in September 1965, the ninth grade was removed from 38 overcrowded junior high schools located largely in ghetto neighborhoods, and the students were transferred to high schools. The students attending these truncated schools were largely economically disadvantaged Negro and Puerto Rican youngsters, many of whom were educationally retarded. In order to increase their motivation for learning and to improve their educational standing, the receiving high schools were to provide these entering ninth graders with compensatory educational services. The funds for obtaining the additional teaching and nonteaching positions as well as materials and supplies to achieve the objectives of the program were provided by the federal government under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA).

In June 1966, at the end of its first year, the transfer plan was evaluated in seven representative academic high schools receiving substantial numbers of these students.¹ School personnel recorded their reactions to the plan, the academic performance of more than 1,000 disadvantaged ninth graders was evaluated, and their reading achievement scores were compared with those of their ninth-grade peers in junior high schools that were comparable in terms of ethnic distribution and socioeconomic level.

The transfer plan helped to improve racial balance in the high schools, but at the cost of overcrowding and truancy. The school staff was generally sympathetic to the plan but felt that the schools were not ready for the change. The curriculum, including the remedial courses, was not meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. Gains made in reading comprehension were no greater among the high school ninth-grade transfer students than among comparable junior high school ninth graders.

During the following school year, 1966-67, Title I funds for compensatory school services were recycled with no increase in monies. The

¹ Edward Frankel, The Four Year Comprehensive High School: Ninth Year Transfer Plan, (New York: Center for Urban Education, August 21, 1966).

schools were to accommodate another group of disadvantaged ninth-grade students, September 1966 entrants, in addition to the tenth graders who had entered the ninth grade in September 1965. The 1966-67 evaluation was directed to both of these groups studied, in six of the seven academic high schools during the previous year. In addition, the students in three vocational high schools were added to the study population. Moreover, an intensive study of the ninth- and tenth-grade curriculums and student achievement was conducted in three academic high schools and in one vocational high school.²

The problems of overcrowding, limited curriculum changes, and traditional teaching methods existed at both the ninth and tenth grade levels. The majority of teachers and chairmen were not in favor of the plan as a method of attaining quality, integrated education. Tenth graders who were in high school last year did not differ significantly in reading from tenth graders who spent the ninth grade in junior high schools. Gains made in reading by comparable high school and junior high school ninth graders were also substantially the same.

Present Study

Title I funds were not granted this year to provide continued compensatory educational services for these students now in their third year of high school (ninth-grade entrants of 1966), nor for the evaluation of the program. The Board of Education, nevertheless, provided funds to conduct a follow-up study to determine if there were any long-range effects of the transfer program on disadvantaged students still in school. The two previous studies of the transfer program provided the guidelines and foundation for this evaluation. This present study, however, was more limited than its predecessors in both scope and objectives.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the present evaluation was to find out what effect, if any, the transfer program had on the academic achievement, drop-out rate, and attitude toward school of disadvantaged students who were in their third year of high school during 1967-68. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are some of the characteristics of these disadvantaged students who stay in school?
2. What has been the effect of this program on the drop-out rate among these disadvantaged students?
3. What has been the effect of the transfer plan on the academic performance of these disadvantaged students?

² Edward Frankel, Grade Reorganization Preparatory to the Establishment Of The Four Year Comprehensive High School, (New York: Center for Urban Education, September 1967).

POPULATIONS IN THE STUDY

The evaluation was limited to students in four of the high schools used in last year's study. The student sample consisted of disadvantaged Negro and Puerto Rican students who entered these high schools as ninth graders in September 1965 from the truncated, segregated junior high schools, and who were still in school three years later. There was a comparison group of similar students who were admitted to the same high schools in September 1966 as tenth graders who also came from segregated junior high schools. The two groups are referred to as the 1965 ninth-grade entrants and the 1966 tenth-grade entrants respectively. The four schools participating in this study are coded as follows: "E," "T," "C," and "G." (See Appendix C.)

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The study sought to determine the possible long-range effects of the ninth-grade transfer program on disadvantaged youngsters with respect to their attitude toward schools and education, drop-out rates, and academic performance. Its primary concern was with "stayins," those disadvantaged students who remained in high school for at least three consecutive years.

The impact of the transfer program on academic performance was measured by comparing the two groups, the ninth-grade and tenth-grade entrants, in reading achievement, attendance, track, and the number and kinds of major subjects passed in the tenth and in the eleventh grades of high schools.

The effects of the transfer program in keeping students in school was determined by comparing the percentages of 1965 and 1966 entrants who remained in school at the end of the tenth and at the end of the eleventh grades of high school. The 1965 entrants, as previously noted, had participated in the transfer program, entering the high school in grade nine. Data describing the characteristics of "stayins" were obtained from a subsample of 1965 entrants chosen on the basis of reading ability and academic achievement in the tenth grade. These students were interviewed by a team of evaluators; in addition, questionnaire responses were obtained from their guidance counselors and from two of their eleventh-grade major-subject teachers.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES

CONFERENCES WITH PRINCIPALS

Conferences with the principals and the administrators of the four selected high schools were held in February 1968. In advance of these meetings, each principal received a letter explaining the nature and scope of the follow-up study. The purpose of the conferences was to discuss the school's administrative and curriculum adjustments for the 1965 ninth-grade entrants now in the eleventh grade (see Appendix B). The principal was also asked about the current ethnic census of the school, efforts at integration, special services, and for information on student attendance, lateness, cutting, and general deportment for both student samples (1965 ninth-grade entrants and 1966 tenth-grade entrants).

POPULATION SAMPLES

The 1965 ninth-grade entrants represented a random sampling of 284 students who entered the four high schools as ninth graders in September 1965 from segregated, truncated junior high schools and remained in the same high school for three consecutive years.

The 1966 tenth-grade entrants were the comparison group which consisted of a random sample of 245 students who entered the four high schools as tenth graders in September 1966 from junior high schools similar to those from which the 1965 ninth-grade entrants came. These students had been in the same high school for two consecutive years from the time they entered in September 1966 until June 30, 1968. They had spent the ninth year in junior high school.

The two samples were compared for differences in sex ratios and ethnic distribution.¹

1. Sex ratio. There were 59 per cent boys and 41 per cent girls in the 1965 entrant sample; the 1966 sample contained 57 per cent boys and 43 per cent girls. These differences were not statistically significant. This was equally true for the sex ratios in each of the three academic high schools in the study that were coeducational.

2. Ethnic composition. The ethnic distribution of Negro and Puerto Rican students in the two samples was not statistically significant.² Among the 1965 entrants, there were 22 per cent Puerto Rican and 78 per cent Negro students; in the 1966 group, these percentages were 29 and 71 respectively.

¹These data are summarized in Appendix A, Tables 1 and 2

²Significant ethnic differences between 1965 and 1966 entrants were found only in school "E".

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

How Performance Was Measured

Student performance was measured by attendance records, reading comprehension scores, track, and academic achievement as expressed by the number and kinds of major subjects passed. The 1965 ninth-grade entrants were compared with the 1966 tenth-grade entrants with respect to the following:

1. Metropolitan Reading Test comprehension grade equivalent (April 1, 1967 testing).
2. Attendance during the tenth and eleventh grades.
3. Course of study track followed in the tenth and eleventh grade.
4. Total number of major subjects passed in the tenth and eleventh grades.
5. Individual major subjects passed in the eleventh grade.

Source of Data

These data were transcribed from official school records and from the student data card used in last year's study. Data for the current school year were obtained from the student cumulative record card and other official school documents such as roll books and report cards which were transcribed to a student data card which was prepared for this study.³ Identifying information and tenth-grade data were transcribed from last year's student data card.

HOLDING POWER OF THE SCHOOLS

It is in the tenth and eleventh grades that the holding power of the high schools is put to the test. Students are generally sixteen years old at this point, hence eligible to obtain employment certificates and leave school. Those who are seventeen years old may withdraw from school because of age. The holding power of the high schools was studied to determine the possible long-range effects of the transfer program on the drop-out rates among disadvantaged students. This function of the school was measured by comparing the number of 1965 and 1966 entrants on register at the beginning and the end of the school year for two consecutive years, 1966-67 and 1967-68.

The official transfer records of all students leaving the school were studied to determine the official date of discharge, the reason for leaving school, and the place to which the student was discharged.

³ A copy of the Student Data Card may be found in Appendix B.

The reasons for leaving the specific school were also considered, including voluntary dropouts before graduation or transfers to other high schools in the city.

The 1965 and 1966 entrant groups were compared for the percentages of dropouts, and also for the percentages transferring to other high schools in the city.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STAYINS

This part of the study concerned itself with "stayins," that is, those students among the 1965 ninth-grade entrants who had participated in the transfer program for three years, but who might have become dropouts because of poor school achievement or poor reading ability. An attempt was made to find out why they did so poorly and also why they remained in school in spite of poor achievement. Lack of sufficient time and funds did not permit extension of this phase of the study to similar students among the 1966 tenth-grade entrants and also to dropouts.

The criteria employed in selecting a subsample were tenth-grade reading-comprehension grade equivalents based on the April 1967 citywide testing and tenth-grade achievement as expressed by the number of major school subjects passed during the fall and spring terms of the 1967-68 school year.

Truants, who were defined as students with 20 or more days of unauthorized absence during a school term, were excluded since they were not available for interviews and also because, as truants, they were failed in all subjects at the end of each school term.

In order to obtain a representative sampling of "stayins" among the 1965 ninth-grade entrants, students falling into the following three categories were selected:

1. Average or above average in reading ability and low achievement. These were students with reading scores of 8.5 or more who had failed at least half the tenth-grade major subjects during the fall and spring terms.
2. Below average in reading ability and low achievement. In this category were found students reading below 8.5 who had failed at least five major subjects during the fall and spring terms of the tenth grade.
3. Below average reading ability and good achievement. These students were also reading below the 8.5 grade equivalent, and had not failed in more than two major subjects during the fall and spring terms of the tenth year.

Students falling into these three categories in each of the four high schools were selected at random from the study population for intensive study. There were 15 in the first category, 10 in the second, and 20 in the third category, a total of 45 students representing about 15 per cent of the entire 1965 ninth-grade entrant sample.

Source of Data

Data describing these 45 students were obtained from three sources: the students themselves by direct interview with a member of the evaluation team; the guidance counselor by means of a questionnaire; and two current eleventh grade major subjects teachers, one who taught English and the other one who knew the students fairly well.

On the basis of a preliminary study at High School "E", methods for collecting these data were established and the instruments were revised.

Data Collection

In each of the four schools, the director of guidance was requested to distribute materials to the guidance counselors of the students selected for study. Each counselor was asked to arrange for the student interview. Questionnaires for the counselors and for the classroom teachers were distributed.

Interview Procedure

The individual interviews were usually conducted by the survey staff. Students were told the reason for the interview, given the option of participating, assured that all information would be confidential, and told that they did not have to answer any question that they felt was an invasion of their privacy.

Instruments

Student interview schedule. The questions put to the students explored their feelings about the school and about dropping out. The interviews included discussions on the students' present course of study and its value for the future, their educational plans, the reasons for academic successes and failures, and finally, some of the factors that they believed might help to curtail drop outs. Some background data were also elicited.

Guidance counselor questionnaire. This questionnaire attempted to determine how often the counselor had seen the students and the reasons for counselling. The counselor was asked about students' ability and motivation for school as well as the amount of parental education, parents' economic status, parental attitude toward school, family organization, and the like. The counselor was also asked to list any special problems of the student, special talents, special assistance he needed to remain in school, and to estimate how much schooling he would probably complete.

Classroom teachers' questionnaire. The English teacher and one other teacher familiar with the student completed this questionnaire. Where possible, a current teacher who had taught the student previously was selected and asked to rate the present performance as compared to past performance. Teachers were also asked to rate the student on 10 items related to classroom performance. They were also asked to predict how much schooling they felt the student would complete, and to state what special assistance he was receiving from the teacher, and what special assistance he needed to stay in school. In addition, the teacher responded to questions on the drop-out problem.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

The findings are organized and presented in the following sequence:

- A. Responses of principals to interviews regarding current data about the school and the eleventh grade disadvantaged population.
- B. Academic performance of the two groups as expressed by reading ability, attendance, track, number of major subjects passed, and achievement in major subject areas.
- C. Holding power of the schools for 1965 and 1966 entrants during the tenth and eleventh grades.
- D. Characteristics of all "stayins" based on a sampling of 1965 entrants.

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS

Interviews with the principal and his administrative staff were conducted in four high schools in February 1968. The findings were listed for each school:

High School "E"

The ethnic composition of school "E" was fairly constant for the three years from 1965 through 1967. The Negro population stabilized at 38 per cent, the Puerto Rican rose from 6 to 9 per cent, and the Other population fell from 55 to 52 per cent. The total school population increased from 4,470 in 1965 to 4,645 in 1967.

According to the principal, the 1965 ninth-grade entrants were completely assimilated within the school and it was difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish this group from their classmates. There were no major changes in the eleventh grade, either on the administrative or curricular levels, to accommodate these students, but there was an increase in the time allowance for personnel dealing with attendance, lateness, cutting, discipline, and group guidance. Modified curricula had been extended to all subjects and there was a continuing need for more remedial reading classes and trained reading personnel.

High School "C"

Between 1965 and 1967, the school "C" population grew from 3,125 to 4,400, a 40 per cent increase which resulted in overcrowding and an extended school day. The Negro population more than doubled in this period, increasing from 15 to 33 per cent. The number of Puerto Rican students remained the same, while the Other population declined from 82 to 64 per cent. On October 30, 1967 there were 155 Puerto Rican, 1,430 Negro, and 2,815 Other students in the school.

Curricular changes introduced in the two previous years were extended into the eleventh grade wherever possible. There was a special remedial track for those retarded more than two years in reading and a double English period for more severely retarded readers in the eleventh year. Teachers of remedial classes continued to receive orientation in methods of teaching these students. A guidance counselor had been assigned to follow the progress of students in the special remedial track.

The services of a psychologist and of social workers were made available on a regular basis several times a week.

There was a marked increase in chronic absenteeism, lateness to school, and in cutting of classes. The Office of the Dean had increased the services in these areas.

The principal felt that these students required a more structured environment, improved school attendance, and a better background in basic skills -- reading and arithmetic. For those with records of failure, non-attendance, emotional instability, and immaturity, he recommended a simplified educational pattern for the two or three years prior to their entrance into high school and also a meaningful curriculum for those of limited educational achievement.

High School "T"

The ethnic composition of school "T" was fairly constant for the three years. In 1965 there were 250 Puerto Rican students in the school; in 1967 there were 220; the corresponding percentages were 5.6 and 5.3. Negro students increased from 550 to 690, from 13 to 17 per cent; the Other population declined from 3,600 to 3,200, or from 82 to 78 per cent in the three-year period.

As in the other two academic high schools, the disadvantaged students now in the eleventh grade had been assimilated within the school. Because deficiencies in the basic educational skills persisted, more eleventh grade subject classes and more remedial English classes for general diploma students were created. The addition of a guidance counselor made possible a reduction of the case load of all counselors, thus affording these students more time.

The school administrators indicated that the attendance, cutting, lateness, and discipline records of these students, on the whole, were poorer than those of other eleventh graders. A faculty Human Relations Committee was studying the problem of involving these students in the extra-curricular program of the school.

Some of the special needs of these students which the school was not able to provide were: adults with whom they can identify, more employment opportunity while attending school, motivation for regular attendance at school, stimulation of faith in middle-class white teachers, and effective tutorial programs. After-school programs were not successful because students did not attend.

In addition, for varied reasons relating to their home life patterns, these students had difficulty in doing homework. Homework centers with teachers in charge were suggested as a means of meeting the students' needs more effectively than provisions for tutoring.

High School "G"

Ethnically, this school was relatively stable in the past three years. The total population was 2,260 in 1965 and 1,950 in 1967. The Puerto Rican population declined from 525 to 420, from 23 to 22 per cent; the Negro population went from 880 to 780 or from 39 to 40 per cent and the "Others" went from 850 to 745 or 38 per cent.

No special administrative or curricular changes were made for these students, except for special reading and math classes, which were to be continued as long as necessary. There had been an improvement in the attendance, lateness, cutting, and general deportment since they were absorbed into regular classes.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Reading Achievement

Achievement in reading was assessed by comparing the reading comprehension grade equivalents of the two groups on the April 1967 citywide Metropolitan Reading Test.

The 1965 subsample consisted of 248 students or 87.3 per cent of the original sample; the 1966 subsample contained 211 or 86.1 per cent of the population. These subsamples were not significantly different in size from the total population.¹

The two subsamples were also not significantly different from the parent population in sex ratio or ethnic distribution.¹ There was, however, a difference in the ethnic composition of the 1965 and the 1966 subsamples. There were 21.4 per cent Puerto Ricans and 78.6 per cent Negroes in the 1965 subsample whereas the 1966 subsample was composed of 31.8 per cent Puerto Rican and 68.2 per cent Negro.²

The mean reading comprehension grade equivalent scores of the two groups in the academic and vocational schools, as well as in the two kinds of schools combined were not significantly different.¹ In the academic high schools, the mean scores were 8.6 for the 1965 entrants and 8.7 for the 1966 group. In the vocational school, these grade equivalents were 8.3 and 8.5 respectively. In the schools combined, the 1966 entrants were reading at 8.5 and their 1965 counterparts at 8.6. It should be noted that these scores were more than two years below 10.8 which is the norm for this test at the time it was administered.

¹ These data are summarized in Appendix A, Table 3

² These data are summarized in Appendix A, Table 4

Reading scores were also analyzed by levels of achievement. (See Table 4.) Those with grade equivalents of 7.5 to 9.5, one year above or below the mean reading score of 8.5 for the group, were placed at the "average" level; those with scores above 9.5 were in the "above average" level and those below 7.5 were at the "below average" level.³

The distribution of scores among the three levels was not significantly different for the 1965 and 1966 entrants in the academic, vocational, and both kinds of schools combined. There were more vocational than academic school students reading below 7.5, and slightly more 1966 than 1965 entrants in the schools combined, reading above 9.5.

Attendance.

One of the criteria frequently employed to assess student attitude toward school is attendance. The 1965 and the 1966 entrants were compared for differences in the number of days absent from school during the tenth and eleventh grades.

Truants were excluded from this analysis, a truant being defined as a student with twenty or more days of unexcused absence from school during a school term and classified as a truant by the school. There were 20 truants among the 1965 entrants (7 per cent of the sample) and 17 among the 1966 entrants (7 per cent of the sample). The exclusion of these truants did not change the statistical equivalence of the two groups in size, sex ratios, or ethnic composition.

Average attendance. An analysis of the average attendance of the 1965 and the 1966 entrants revealed the following:⁴

During the school year 1966-67 when the students were in the tenth grade, the 1965 entrants in both kinds of schools combined averaged 18.4 days absent from school while the 1966 entrants absented themselves 14.6 days, a difference that was statistically significant.

For the first half of 1967-68, when the students were in the eleventh grade, the average absence for the 1965 entrants was 12.4 days and for the 1966 entrants 9.2 days, a difference that was again statistically significant.

During the second half of the eleventh grade, the attendance records of the two groups was an average of 12.0 days absent for the 1965 entrants and 10.8 for the 1966 entrants; this difference was not statistically significant.

For the entire eleventh grade, the 1965 entrants were absent significantly more often, an average of 24.4 days as compared to the 1966 entrants who were absent an average of 20.0 days.

³These data are summarized in Appendix A, Table 5

⁴These data are summarized in Appendix A, Table 6

Throughout 1966 and 1967, the 1965 entrants as a group were absent significantly more days than the 1966 entrants. This difference was significant among the academic subgroups but not among the vocational subgroups. It was also noted that the attendance of the vocational students was consistently better than that of the students in the academic schools.

Absence by intervals. Absence was also analyzed by intervals based on the following categories:⁵

1. "Good attendance" defined as 0 to 4 days of absence for the term and 0 to 4 days of absence for the school year.
2. "Fair attendance" defined as 5 to 9 days of absence for the term and 10 to 19 days of absence for the school year.
3. "Poor attendance" defined as 10 to 19 days of absence for the term and 20 to 39 days of absence for the school year.
4. "Very poor attendance" defined as 20 or more days of absence for the term and 40 or more days of absence for the school year. These were not classified as truants by the school since their absences were authorized.

The tenth-grade attendance pattern of the 1965 and 1966 entrants was significantly different; there were about twice as many 1965 as 1966 entrants with "very poor" attendance during the 1966-67 school year, that is, absent 40 or more days: 10.2 per cent of the former and 5.7 per cent of the latter.

During the first half of the eleventh grade, from September 1967 to January 1968, the distribution pattern of absence among the 1965 and the 1966 entrants was not statistically significant; 32 per cent of the 1965 entrants and 37 per cent of the 1966 entrants had "good" attendance records.

In the second half of the eleventh grade, the pattern seen in the first half was repeated with no significant differences between the 1965 and the 1966 groups in the academic, the vocational, and in both kinds of schools combined.

The total eleventh grade pattern of attendance was somewhat worse for the 1965 than for the 1966 entrants. Almost twice as many of the 1965 as 1966 entrants were absent 40 days or more, 19.6 per cent as compared to 10.5 per cent.

Course of Study

The course of study pursued by a student is some indication of his academic ability and interest. Those planning to continue their education

⁵A summary of these data is found in Appendix A, Tables 7 and 8

beyond high school are usually enrolled in an academic track, those planning to go to work in the commercial field after graduation from high school are usually enrolled in the commercial track, and students in the academic high school who are educationally retarded are most likely to be enrolled in the general track. In the vocational school, students may be enrolled either in one of several vocational tracks or in a special technical electronics course if they pass the school's qualifying test. The latter track qualifies the student to continue his education in the field of engineering on the college level and is comparable in difficulty to the academic track in the academic schools.

The track designation was determined either by the school or by the kinds of courses the student was carrying. In several instances, the school permitted a student to carry one or two courses not in his track. This practice occurred among students who sought to change their track and were encouraged to do so by the guidance counselor.

The 1965 and 1966 entrants were compared for differences in the distribution of students in the three tracks in the academic high schools and the two vocational school tracks during their tenth and eleventh grades.⁶ Changes in track were also noted.

There were significant differences in the courses followed by the students in the two groups in the tenth grade. More 1965 than 1966 entrants were in the general track: 66.3 per cent as compared to 50.5 per cent. On the other hand, an academic track accounted for 30.0 per cent of the 1965 entrants and 41.2 per cent of the 1966 entrants. Few students were enrolled in the commercial track, 3.4 and 8.3 per cents respectively. In the academic high schools, there were 10 per cent more 1966 than 1965 entrants in the academic track, but 15 per cent fewer of the 1966 than 1965 entrants in the general track. In the vocational school, 6.5 per cent of the 1965 entrants and 17.5 per cent of the 1966 entrants were in the special technical electronics track, the remainder were in the general vocational track.

By the eleventh grade, the two groups were not significantly different in the tracks followed in the academic, the vocational and in both types of schools. In both schools combined, 28.8 per cent of 1965 entrants and 33.3 per cent of the 1966 entrants were following an academic curriculum; 61.7 and 56.5 per cent of the two groups were in the general track, and 9.5 as compared to 10.1 per cent in the commercial track. In the vocational school, five of the ten 1966 entrants in the special technical electronics courses were transferred into the general curriculum.

The changes in track from the tenth to the eleventh grades among the 1965 and 1966 entrants were also compared to determine the extent and nature of these changes.⁷

⁶ A summary of these data is found in Appendix A, Table 9

⁷ Changes in track are summarized in Appendix A, Table 10

The percentage changes among 1965 and 1966 entrants were 12.2 and 15.8 respectively. However, the changes in track were statistically significant only among 1965 entrants in the academic school and in both schools combined.

The 1966 entrants did not make significant changes in track either in academic, vocational, or in both schools combined.

The changes among the 1965 entrants tended to be mostly from a general to a commercial track and the changes among the 1966 group was from an academic to a general track.

Number of Major Subjects Passed

One measure of academic achievement is the number of major subjects passed and failed in a school year. In comparing the scholastic performance of the 1965 and the 1966 entrants during their tenth and eleventh years of high school, no distinction was made of the track in which the subject was studied. A major subject was defined as one given at least five times a week and credited as a major subject by the school.

In the analysis, the number of major subjects passed by the two groups of students was compared for the tenth grade, the first half of the eleventh grade, the second half of the eleventh grade, and the total eleventh grade.⁸

There was no significant difference in the number of major subjects passed by two groups in the tenth grade. Both took an average of 8.4 majors and passed 6.3 of them. The 1965 entrants were successful in 75 per cent and the 1966 entrants in 74 per cent of the subjects studied. In the vocational school, the 1966 entrants passed significantly more courses than the 1965 entrants, 8.2 and 7.4 respectively, or 91 and 88 per cent respectively. The academic subgroups showed no differences in the number of courses passed. Success was achieved by 69 and 68 per cent respectively.

During the first half of the eleventh grade the achievement record of the two groups was essentially the same as in the tenth grade. The two groups in the academic high school passed about 75 per cent of the subjects and the two groups in the vocational schools passed 80 and 89 per cent respectively of the major subjects.

In the second half of the eleventh grade, the 1965 entrants in both kinds of schools passed 77 per cent of the major subjects and the 1966 entrants 74 per cent. This difference was not significant. In the academic high school, the percentages of subjects passed for the two groups were not significantly different, 70 and 68 respectively. In the vocational school, the 1966 entrants passed significantly more major subjects than the 1965 entrants, 81 per cent compared to 91 per cent.

⁸

Tables summarizing these findings are found in Appendix A, Table 11

For the total eleventh grade, there was no difference in the achievement of the two groups either in the academic, the vocational, or in both kinds of schools combined.

Achievement in Major Subject Areas

An assessment of academic achievement was made in each of the major subject areas to determine the specific strengths and weaknesses of these students. The areas included in the analysis were English, mathematics, social studies, science, language, shop, commercial subjects, and general subjects. The commercial subjects treated together were stenography, distributive education, business arithmetic, dictaphone, and accounting. The subjects defined as general were record keeping and clerical practices. Since there were so few students taking major art and music, these were not included in this analysis.

The number of the 1965 and 1966 entrants passing each major subject during the first and the second half of the eleventh grade was compared.⁹

For the first half of the eleventh year, except for science, there were no significant differences in the percentages of 1965 and 1966 entrants' passing of the seven other major subject areas in the academic, vocational, and both kinds of schools combined. In science, 76 per cent of the 1966 entrants as compared to 61 per cent of the 1965 entrants in academic high schools passed; in the vocational school, the 1965 entrants did better, 91 per cent as compared to 86 per cent; and for the combined schools, the percentages were 65 and 76 per cent respectively passing science.

In the second half of the eleventh year, significant differences in the percentages passing were found only in English and shop. The 1965 entrants in the academic high school did better in English than their 1966 counterparts, 76 per cent as compared to 66 per cent. In the vocational schools the 1966 entrants were more successful, 98 per cent passed English as compared to 84 per cent of 1965 entrants. Thus in the schools combined, significantly more 1965 than 1966 passed English, 81 per cent and 74 per cent respectively. Success in shop was significantly different among the 1965 and 1966 entrants in the vocational school only, where 72 per cent as compared to 90 per cent of the two groups passed. For the schools combined these percentages were 76 and 88 per cent, a difference that was statistically significant.

HOLDING POWER OF THE SCHOOLS

As previously indicated, the drop-out rate is highest in the tenth and eleventh grades of high school when students are eligible to leave school voluntarily either by obtaining a working certificate or because they are 17 years old.

During the school year 1967-68, 54 per cent of all tenth-grade students discharged citywide from the academic high schools were dropouts and 67 per cent of those discharged from the vocational high schools were dropouts. In the eleventh grade, the drop-out rates were 70 per cent in the

⁹For summaries of these data see Appendix A, Tables 12 and 13

academic and 80 per cent in the vocational schools.¹⁰

Rate of Attrition

The effects of the transfer program on the holding power of the participating schools was measured by comparing the rates of attrition between the 1965 and the 1966 entrants during the tenth and eleventh grades in the vocational, the academic, and the two types of schools combined.¹¹

A student was considered as a discharge only when there was an official withdrawal slip which indicated the date and the reason for leaving school.

Tenth grade. During the school year 1966-67, significantly more 1965 than 1966 entrants in the tenth grade left school, 24.0 per cent as compared to 15.5 per cent. In the academic schools, these percentages were 29.4 and 13.7, respectively, and for the vocational school they were 5.9 and 20.8 or four times greater for the 1966 than the 1965 group. These differences were statistically significant.

Eleventh grade. For the school year 1967-68, the rates of attrition were not significantly different for the two groups in the academic, vocational, or both types of schools combined. In the academic sample, it was 26.7 for the 1965 entrants and 23.6 per cent for the 1966 entrants; 28.6 and 26.7 per cent respectively in the vocational school; and 27.7 and 23.9 per cent for both types of schools.

Tenth and eleventh grades. Over the two-year period studied, the rate of attrition was significantly different for the 1965 and the 1966 entrants, 45.1 per cent as compared to 35.7 per cent in both kinds of schools. In the academic schools the losses were 48.2 per cent and 34.9 per cent respectively; in the vocational school, the discharges were 34.5 per cent for the 1965 entrants and 40.6 per cent for the 1966 entrants. These differences were significant for the academic, but not for the vocational school.

After two years there were 54.9 per cent of the 1965 entrants and 64.3 per cent of the 1966 entrants still in school. The survival rate for the 1966 entrants was higher than for the 1965 entrants in the academic high schools, 66.0 per cent as compared to 51.7, but lower in the vocational schools, 59.4 as compared to 65.5 per cent.

Reasons for Leaving School

The reasons for leaving school were also compared among the 1965 and the 1966 entrants who were discharged.¹² Two categories of withdrawals were studied:

¹⁰ Bureau of Attendance, "Pupils Discharged For School Year September 1966 to June 1967", Board of Education, City of New York (mimeographed)

¹¹ These data are summarized in Appendix A, Table 14

¹² Summary of reasons for leaving school in the tenth and eleventh grades is found in Appendix A, Tables 15 and 16

1. Dropouts defined as students discharged because they obtained working certificates or were at least 17 years old.
2. Transferees to other academic and vocational high schools in New York City.

Dropouts.¹³ During the tenth grade, 6.2 per cent of the 1965 entrants as compared to 4.2 per cent of the 1966 entrants were dropouts; this difference, however, was not statistically significant. In the academic schools, more of the 1965 entrants than 1966 entrants dropped out, 6.8 as compared to 2.5 per cent; in the vocational schools the corresponding percentages were 4.2 and 9.4 and the difference here was not significant.

In the eleventh grade, although drop-out rates in both groups were higher than previously, 14.8 for the 1965 entrants and 13.7 for the 1966 entrants, the differences between them were not significant. In the academic high schools, the drop-out percentages were about the same for the two groups, 12.8 and 13.0; in the vocational schools significantly more of the 1965 than 1966 entrants dropped out; 19.6 as compared to 15.8 per cent.

Transfers to other high schools.¹⁴ The data revealed that another prevalent reason for discharging students was to transfer them to another academic or vocational high school in New York City. Since transferees were not interviewed and other sources of information were not available, the reasons for their transfers would only be inferred. Most of the schools to which students transferred tended to have a larger proportion of Negro and Puerto Rican students than the schools from which they came and were located in ghetto areas.

Significantly more 1965 than 1966 entrants transferred to other high schools during the tenth year, 9.3 per cent as compared to 5.2 per cent. There were about twice as many 1965 as 1966 entrants leaving the academic high school, 11.8 per cent as compared to 5.6 per cent. In the vocational school, significantly more of the 1966 entrants left, 7.3 per cent as compared to 0.9 per cent of the 1965 entrants.

During the eleventh year, the rates of transfer were about the same for the two groups, 8.4 and 7.1 per cent respectively. In the academic high schools, 7.8 per cent of the 1965 entrants and 6.9 of the 1966 entrants left for other high schools in the city; in the vocational high schools, these percentages were 9.0 and 8.0. None of these differences were statistically significant.

¹³ Summary of dropouts is found in Appendix A, Table 17

¹⁴ These data are presented in Appendix A, Table 18

CHARACTERISTICS OF "STAYINS"

The descriptive summaries which follow are based on interviews with a subsample of 1965 entrants, the questionnaire responses of their guidance counselors and 86 of their eleventh grade major-subject classroom teachers. As previously indicated, a total of 45 students in three groups were selected at random in four high schools.

Group 1 consisted of students with average or above-average reading comprehension and poor achievement in the tenth grade. There were 15 students in this group with an average reading score of 10.2 and they had passed 35 per cent of their tenth grade subjects.

Group 2 contained students with below-average reading comprehension (less than 8.5) and poor achievement in the tenth grade. In this group there were 10 students whose average reading grade equivalent was 6.2 and who had passed 20 per cent of their major subjects during the tenth grade.

Group 3 was made up of students with below average reading comprehension (less than 8.5) and good achievement in the tenth grade. There were 20 students in this group whose average reading grade equivalent was 6.0, having passed 95 per cent of their tenth grade major subjects.

Student Interview Responses¹⁵

The 45 students interviewed were about equally divided in their choice of the year they liked best, although those in Group 1 tended to favor the eleventh year because they were adjusted to the school and could see graduation just ahead. There was little agreement on the least liked grade year. However, those in Group 2 disliked the tenth year because of scholastic difficulties they encountered. The three groups were equally divided in their choice of junior or senior high school for ninth graders: Group 1 favored junior high school and Group 3 senior high school. The choice seemed to depend on their social and academic success in school.

About one third of the students had thought seriously of dropping out of school, the largest percentage in Group 2 (those with below average reading and poor achievement) and 20 per cent in the other two groups. The chief reason advanced by students for dropping out was lack of interest in school. Other reasons were school failures, pregnancy, family problems and desire to be "on their own." The highest drop-out rate was among the friends of the students in Group 2, Groups 1 and 3 were very similar in the percentages of friends graduating from high school, going beyond high school, and drop-out rates. All the students interviewed said that they would try to dissuade their best friend from dropping out of school, using the argument that a diploma was needed to get a good job. About half the dropouts were reported to be working either part time or full time but mostly in menial jobs; some were in the army, a few were going to night school and the rest were doing nothing, were engaged in shady activities, or were in jail.

¹⁵ See Appendix A, Table 19 for summary of data

About half the students in each group had switched track. Those in the general track tended to remain there. Group 2 students were most dissatisfied with their courses as preparation for the future. Those in the academic and vocational track felt they were getting better preparation than those in the general track. Nobody planned to drop out before graduation and two thirds planned to continue their education beyond high school. The largest percentage of college-bound students were in Group 1. All groups agreed that the major reason for failing subjects was lack of interest; lack of ability and personal problems were also mentioned.

The students generally felt that they were doing better this year than last; Group 2 was the most optimistic. Encouragement to stay in school came mostly from parents, particularly in Group 3. Others who helped were counselors, friends, and teachers, in that order.

To encourage students to stay in school, the prime recommendation was the changing of the curriculum and courses. The chief contribution that the community could make to this end was providing jobs for students.

The data revealed some important differences among the three groups. Group 3 as compared to Group 2 had fewer students who said that they had seriously thought of dropping out of school and had fewer friends who had dropped out, more of them had changed track and were taking courses which they felt were good preparation for the future, more were planning education after high school and more received encouragement from parents, teachers, and counselors to stay in school.

Group 1 tended to show a pattern similar to that of Group 3 with some exceptions; Group 1 preferred junior high school for ninth graders, were less certain about the value of the courses they were studying, and were encouraged to stay in school by teachers and counselors.

Responses of Guidance Counselors.¹⁶

Questionnaires were submitted by the guidance counselors of all the students interviewed. Students were seen on an average of two and a half to three times a year. The interviews dealt primarily with school work for Groups 1 and 2 and were routine for Group 3. The counselors provided little or no information about the background or personal problems of these students.

The average overall counselor ratings for ten school-related items reflected the achievement of the group. Groups 1 and 3 were rated between good and fair (2.7), and Group 2, fair (3.0). About one third of the items, particularly those dealing with student background, were not rated by the counselors.

The counselors thought that reading disabilities were the main problem interfering with the schooling of these students, particularly in Group 3. Other contributory causes mentioned were lack of parental encouragement, difficulty with math, immaturity, poor attendance, and poverty. The diploma

¹⁶

See Appendix A, Table 20, for summary of these data

was regarded as the chief reason for staying in school. This was particularly true of Group 3. Parental support was thought to be a factor for Group 1. Regarding continued schooling, the counselors predicted that about one third of Group 1 and half of Group 2 would drop out. More than half of Group 3 planned to continue their education beyond high school, according to the counselors.

To keep these students in school the counselors suggested special tutoring for all groups, remedial reading for Groups 2 and 3, more guidance and individualized help, and an enriched and expanded curriculum for all. A follow-up study of these students after graduation was suggested.

Classroom Teacher Responses¹⁷

Questionnaires were returned by 86 teachers for all students except one chronic truant and one dropout. Half the responses were from teachers of English and the others from major subjects teachers. The most inexperienced teachers taught the group with poor reading and achievement, Group 2; half of these teachers had taught no more than one and a half years.

Over 40 per cent of the teachers had taught these students in previous terms. The teachers of Group 2 had the least previous contact with the students, probably because they were teaching fewer years than the teachers of the other two groups. Teacher overall ratings reflected school achievement; Group 2 was rated lowest (2.7), Group 1 next (2.5), and Group 3 highest (2.3).

For 86 per cent of the students, teacher prediction of student future schooling was in agreement. The disagreement was on whether students would drop out or be graduated from high school. The greatest drop-out rate was predicted in Group 2 and the smallest in Group 3.

About a third of the teachers reported that they had given these students a little assistance such as individual tutoring and attention, encouragement, friendship, and the like. Two thirds said they gave no special help or did not respond to the question. The teachers said that two thirds of the students were in school either because they wanted to continue their education or to get a diploma. One third did not know or did not respond.

The chief reasons for dropping out of school, according to the teachers, were lack of interest, lack of ability, and constant school failure. Family problems loomed large as reasons in Group 1, constant failure in Group 2, and lack of interest in Group 3, according to the teachers.

To keep students in school, teachers offered a variety of suggestions, the chief one being the need for a more realistic and richer curriculum. Others were jobs and financial assistance, counseling and guidance, providing students with positive and rewarding school experiences, and more teachers who care and understand.

¹⁷ See Appendix A, Table 21, for summary

In a further analysis of the sample to discover additional characteristics of "stayins," the records of the 1965 entrants who dropped out of school during the eleventh grade were studied.¹⁸ The data showed that 7.0 per cent of all Group 1 1965 entrants with average and above-average reading and poor achievement dropped out of school; 22.9 per cent of all Group 2 1965 entrants and 18.3 per cent of Group 3 were dropouts. There was no statistically significant difference in the drop-out rates in Group 2 as compared to Group 3. Contrary to expectation the drop-out rate was not greater among the poor achievers than among the high achievers. In other words, good achievement was not necessarily associated with lower drop-out rates. For the students in these two groups, it appeared that obtaining a high school diploma was not an equally compelling reason for staying in school. The question as to why these students dropped out or, to put it another way, why these students should be different from the "stayins," although beyond the scope of this study, is an important correlate. The "stayins" themselves, their teachers, and guidance counselors suggested a possible answer to this question. All recommended that courses and teaching be made more meaningful, interesting, and practical.

¹⁸See Appendix A, Table 22

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study attempted to assess the effects of the ninth-grade transfer plan on disadvantaged students at the completion of the third year of high school. Specifically, the investigation explored the academic performance of these students, the holding power of the schools, and some of the factors that kept disadvantaged students in school.

The study was limited to disadvantaged eleventh-grade Negro and Puerto Rican students who entered four high schools as ninth graders from segregated, overcrowded, truncated junior high schools, and a comparison group consisting of ethnically comparable students who entered the four high schools as tenth graders, from segregated junior high schools. These two groups were referred to as the 1965 and 1966 entrants.

The academic performance of the two groups was assessed by comparing their reading comprehension scores, attendance, track, and the number and kinds of major subjects passed. The holding power of the school was measured by comparing the number of 1965 and 1966 entrants who left school during the tenth and the eleventh grades. Characteristics of the "stayins" were obtained from a subsample of 1965 entrants by interviews and questionnaire responses from both the guidance counselors and major subject teachers of these students. Interviews were also held with each of the principals and the administrators of the four schools to determine what administrative and curricular adjustments were being made for these students.

The ninth-grade transfer plan was originally designed to facilitate the grade reorganization preparatory to the establishment of the four-year comprehensive high school. This program did not receive Title I funds for the 1967-68 school year. However, ninth-grade students continued to enter the high schools from truncated junior high schools; in addition, feeder junior high schools in ghetto areas had been rezoned. As a consequence, large numbers of tenth graders from disadvantaged neighborhoods entered these high schools.

Principals' Reports

The interviews with the principals and the administrators indicated that the four schools were confronted with the same problems this year as in the previous two years. To alleviate overcrowding, the schools were operating on overlapping, double, and even triple sessions with all the attendant hardships both on students and faculty. Because many of the disadvantaged students continued to demonstrate serious deficiencies in the basic skills, remedial reading classes were extended into the eleventh grade and the general track was broadened to include more subjects. There was a continuing need for more remedial classes and trained personnel. Chronic absenteeism, lateness to school, cutting of classes, and disciplinary offenses increased, compelling the school administrators to expand the

services and assign more personnel to these duties. The extent to which the admission of these ninth graders was responsible for these problems was not assessed by the principals. However, they assumed that the problems were exacerbated by overcrowding and the necessity for multiple sessions.

The eleventh-grade curriculum remained relatively unchanged; few new courses were added to the schools' offerings. Available guidance, health, psychological, and social services were inadequate to meet the needs of the growing school population of disadvantaged youngsters. In general, many of the problems facing these schools today may have been created, in part, by the transfer program.

Attendance

The 1965 entrants were absent from school more often than the 1966 entrants in the tenth and the eleventh grades. These differences between the two groups were greatest in the academic high school subgroups and among those absent 40 or more days. Chronic absenteeism doubled in both groups from the tenth to the eleventh grades, with one out of every five 1965 entrants and one out of every ten 1966 entrants absent 40 or more days in the eleventh grade.

Course of Study-Track

In the tenth grade, more of the 1965 than 1966 entrants were enrolled in the general track and less in the academic. By the eleventh grade, enough of the 1966 entrants shifted from the academic to the general track to eliminate differences in the distribution of the two groups in the three tracks. A similar shift took place among the 1965 entrants between the ninth and the tenth grade. Two-thirds of all the changes among the 1965 entrants was from the general to the commercial track and a similar percentage of 1965 entrants shifted from the academic to the general track.

Major Subjects Passed

The pattern of academic achievement as seen in the number and kinds of major subjects passed was remarkably similar for the two groups. In the tenth and eleventh year, both groups passed about three-fourths of their major subjects. In the first half of the eleventh year, they were equally successful in mathematics, social studies, language, shop, commercial and general subjects. Only in science did more of the 1966 than 1965 entrants pass. In the second half of the eleventh grade, the only differences were in English where more of the 1965 entrants passed, and shop, where more of the 1966 entrants were successful.

Holding Power

Although the number of withdrawals from school among the 1965 as compared to the 1966 entrants was greater in the tenth grade, this difference did not exist by the eleventh grade.

Drop-out rates among the 1965 and the 1966 entrants more than doubled from the tenth to the eleventh years, but the differences between the two groups were not significant either year. During the tenth year, more 1965 entrants in the academic high schools dropped out; in the eleventh year, more of the 1966 entrants in the vocational school dropped out.

Transfers to other high schools in the city were somewhat greater among the 1965 entrants in the tenth year but not significantly different from that of the 1966 entrants in the eleventh year. The only significant difference between the two groups was found in the tenth year among the 1965 entrants in the academic high schools, as compared to their 1966 counterparts.

In transferring to other high schools, the overwhelming choice was an academic rather than a vocational high school and one in which the proportion of Negro and Puerto Rican students was greater than the school from which they came.

Academic Achievement

In general, the 1965 and the 1966 entrants were very similar in reading ability, attendance, course of study followed, number and kinds of major subjects passed. The differences seen in the tenth grade tended to diminish or disappear in the eleventh grade.

Reading Achievement

The results were consistent with those of the two previous studies. There were no significant differences between the 1965 and the 1966 entrants in reading comprehension, and both groups were at least two years below the tenth-grade norm. There was little reason to believe that there has been any dramatic change in the reading level of these students during the eleventh grade.

"Stayins"

Students, guidance counselors, and teachers agreed that the chief motivation among the disadvantaged students studied for staying in school was the desire to acquire a high school diploma which these students regarded as the key to better jobs and a more secure future. Achievement among these students appeared to be positively associated with encouragement from parents, friends, and teachers to stay in school. This relationship held regardless of ability, achievement, or background. Poor attendance, excessive cutting, parental indifference, broken homes, and poverty were some of the factors associated with poor reading ability and poor achievement. Success in school was a powerful influence for keeping them in school; there were more good than poor achievers among the "stayins," but this was not the most compelling reason for staying in school. The poorest group in ability and achievement was being taught by the most inexperienced teachers. Finally, the students, counselors, and teachers felt that more meaningful courses and teaching were powerful means for keeping students in school.

CONCLUSIONS

The transfer plan as a step toward grade reorganization in establishing the four year comprehensive high school has been set aside, at least for the time being, and federal funds for providing compensatory school services for disadvantaged students were not made available this year. Whatever was done for these students this year was achieved within the framework of existing school services and funds made available by the Board of Education. It is against this background that the conclusions emerging from this study should be seen.

There was little change in these schools except for administrative adjustment to alleviate overcrowding and the extension of a few remedial-reading and other remedial classes into the eleventh grade, to cope with the educational retardation of some of these disadvantaged students.

Thus, students who came into the high schools three years ago as ninth graders did not appear to perform better academically than those who came in two years ago as tenth graders. In fact, the 1965 entrants were absent more frequently and absences increased for both groups in the eleventh year, more so in the academic than in the vocational schools.

The holding power of the schools was no greater for the 1965 than the 1966 entrants; transfer and drop-out rates were highest among the 1965 entrants in the academic high schools. The extra year in high school for the 1965 entrants did not appear to make high school more attractive to them.

About one half of the 1965 and two thirds of the 1966 entrants completed the eleventh year in high school. They were still in school because they wanted a high school diploma and they were encouraged to stay in school by their friends, teachers, and parents. Other compelling reasons were success in school, experienced teachers, and a meaningful curriculum.

The overall conclusion that may be drawn from this study is that the transfer plan has failed to achieve its goals largely because of incomplete implementation. Whatever steps were taken during the first year of the transfer program to meet the needs of the disadvantaged students appeared to have been progressively diluted and reduced within the ensuing two years. The solution to the problems of keeping disadvantaged students in high school and providing them with significant and meaningful educational experiences was not found in the transfer program which was then permitted to expire.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The fact of the discontinuance of the ninth year transfer program should not, in any way, relieve the educational system of the need to provide other compensatory services to disadvantaged high school youngsters. In fact, it strongly suggests the need to both intensify and extend existing services and to seek new means of meeting their needs.
2. It is suggested that the students who were admitted in 1966 as part of this transfer program be provided, during their senior year, with those compensatory services that were originally intended as part of the transfer program.
3. The negative findings of the high school transfer program cast serious doubts as to the scope and effectiveness of the total remedial and compensatory program, and suggest the need for intensive studies of the total range of these services at the high school level.
4. Organization changes, such as the ninth year transfer program are, in themselves, unequal to the task of providing the compensatory services needed by disadvantaged high school youth. They should be accompanied by massive and sustained infusion of other services, including remediation, guidance, curricular revision, teacher training, smaller classes, and more flexible programming.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF SEX RATIO AMONG GROUPS OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

School	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants			Chi Square	p
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total		
E	28	50	78	46	56	102	1.6	n.s.
T	38	37	75	7	17	24	3.1	n.s.
C	23	30	53	29	33	62	0.3	n.s.
G	78	0	78	57	0	57		
Total	167	117	284	139	106	245	0.3	n.s.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION IN GROUPS OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants			Chi Square	p
	P.R. No. (%)	N No. (%)	Total	P.R. No. (%)	N No. (%)	Total		
E	5(6)	73(94)	78	29(28)	73(72)	102	16.7	01
T	24(32)	51(68)	75	7(29)	17(71)	24	0.2	n.s.
C	4(8)	49(92)	53	11(18)	51(82)	62	2.8	n.s.
G	28(36)	50(64)	78	23(40)	34(60)	57	0.1	n.s.
Total	61(22)	223(78)	284	70(29)	175(71)	245	3.2	n.s.

TABLE 3

COMPARISONS BETWEEN TOTAL SAMPLES OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS
AND SUBSAMPLES WITH READING COMPREHENSION SCORES

<u>Numbers</u>	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants	Chi Square	p
With scores	248			211		
No scores	36			34		
Total	284			245	0.3	n.s.

<u>Sex Ratios</u>	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants				
	Boys	Girls	Both	Boys	Girls	Both		
Numbers								
Total	167	117	284	139	106	245	0.3	n.s.
With scores	147	101	248	121	90	211	0.1	n.s.
Chi square	0.01			0.01				
p	n.s.			n.s.				

<u>Ethnic Distribution</u>	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants				
	P.R.	N	Both	P.R.	N	Both		
Numbers								
Total	61	223	284	70	175	245	3.2	n.s.
With scores	53	195	248	67	144	211	6.6	01
Chi square	0			0.7				
p	n.s.			n.s.				

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF APRIL 1967 READING COMPREHENSION GRADE
EQUIVALENTS OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

1965 Entrants				1966 Entrants				
Schools	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	"t"	p
Academic	179	8.60	2.33	163	8.70	2.16	0.40	n.s.
Vocational	69	8.31	2.33	48	8.45	2.57	0.31	n.s.
Combined	248	8.52	2.33	211	8.64	2.25	0.57	n.s.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF APRIL 1967 READING COMPREHENSION GRADE EQUIVALENTS
OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

Group	Academic				Vocational			
	1965 Entrants No.	1965 Entrants Percent	1966 Entrants No.	1966 Entrants Percent	1965 Entrants No.	1965 Entrants Percent	1966 Entrants No.	1966 Entrants Percent
9.6 & up	74	41.3	65	40.0	20	29.0	22	45.8
9.5 - 7.5	50	28.0	55	33.7	22	31.9	8	16.7
Below 7.5	55	30.7	43	26.3	27	39.1	18	37.5
Total	179	100.0	163	100.0	69	100.0	48	100.0
Chi square	1.63				4.0			
p	n.s.				n.s.			

BOTH SCHOOLS COMBINED

9.6 & up	94	37.9	87	41.2
9.5 - 7.5	72	29.0	63	29.9
Below 7.5	82	33.1	61	28.9
Total	284	100.0	211	100.0
Chi square	1.06			
p	n.s.			

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL
AMONG 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

<u>Tenth Grade</u>	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants			"t"	p
	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.		
Academic	187	19.90	17.27	171	15.71	14.54	2.47	01
Vocational	77	14.54	13.35	57	11.19	10.66	1.57	n.s.
Both	264	18.35	16.39	228	14.57	13.79	2.73	01
<u>Eleventh Grade: First Half</u>								
Academic	187	13.66	14.86	171	10.09	8.92	2.72	01
Vocational	77	9.48	9.99	57	6.52	6.86	1.93	n.s.
Both	264	12.44	13.73	228	9.20	8.58	3.08	01
<u>Eleventh Grade: Second Half</u>								
Academic	187	12.88	9.96	171	11.49	9.30	1.36	n.s.
Vocational	77	9.70	9.08	57	8.70	7.65	0.67	n.s.
Both	264	11.96	9.80	228	10.80	8.99	1.35	n.s.
<u>Eleventh Grade Total</u>								
Academic	187	26.54	20.02	171	21.58	14.98	2.95	01
Vocational	77	19.18	17.02	57	15.22	12.01	1.56	n.s.
Both	264	24.39	19.45	228	20.00	14.14	3.12	01

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL
AMONG 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

Tenth Grade - 1966-67								
Academic High School					Vocational High School			
Days Absent	1965 Entrants No. Percent		1966 Entrants No. Percent		1965 Entrants No. Percent		1966 Entrants No. Percent	
0-9	62	33.2	75	43.9	32	41.5	32	56.1
10-19	52	27.8	50	29.2	21	27.3	16	28.1
20-39	51	27.8	34	19.9	19	24.7	8	14.0
40 plus	22	11.2	12	7.0	5	6.5	1	1.8
Total	187	100.0	171	100.0	77	100.0	57	100.0
Chi square			7.16				5.65	
p			n.s.				n.s.	

Eleventh Grade - First Half - Sept. 1967								
0-4	51	27.3	54	31.6	33	42.8	31	54.4
5-9	43	23.0	41	24.0	15	19.5	10	17.5
10-19	57	30.5	50	29.2	17	22.1	13	22.8
20 plus	36	19.2	26	15.2	12	15.6	3	5.3
Total	187	100.0	171	100.0	77	100.0	57	100.0
Chi square			1.73				3.68	
p			n.s.				n.s.	

Eleventh Grade - Second Half - Feb. 1968								
0-4	43	22.9	45	26.3	28	36.3	19	33.3
5-9	41	21.9	42	24.6	16	20.8	16	28.1
10-19	57	30.6	58	33.9	23	29.9	14	24.6
20 plus	46	24.6	26	15.2	10	13.0	8	14.0
Total	187	100.0	171	100.0	77	100.0	57	100.0
Chi square			5.97				1.16	
p			n.s.				n.s.	

Eleventh Grade - Total Year 1967-68								
0-9	37	19.8	41	24.0	28	36.3	22	38.6
10-19	46	24.6	53	31.0	17	22.1	16	28.1
20-39	63	33.7	55	32.2	24	31.2	17	29.8
40 plus	41	21.9	22	12.8	8	10.4	2	3.5
Total	187	100.0	171	100.0	77	100.0	57	100.0
Chi square			6.04				2.35	
p			n.s.				n.s.	

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL
AMONG 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS
IN SCHOOLS COMBINED

Tenth Grade - 1967-68

Days Absent	1965 Entrants		1966 Entrants		Chi Square	p
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent		
0-9	96	36.4	107	46.9	10.03	01
10-19	71	26.9	66	28.9		
20-39	70	26.5	42	18.5		
40 plus	27	10.2	13	5.7		
Total	264	100.0	228	100.0		

Eleventh Grade - First Half - Sept. 1967

0-4	84	31.8	85	37.3	3.80	n.s.
5-9	58	22.0	51	22.4		
10-19	74	28.0	63	27.6		
20 plus	48	18.2	29	12.7		
Total	264	100.0	228	100.0		

Eleventh Grade - Second Half - Feb. 1968

0-4	71	26.9	64	28.1	3.86	n.s.
5-9	57	21.6	58	25.4		
10-19	80	30.3	72	31.6		
20 plus	56	21.2	34	14.9		
Total	264	100.0	228	100.0		

Eleventh Grade - Total Year 1967-68

0-9	65	24.6	63	27.6	7.83	05
10-19	63	23.9	69	30.3		
20-39	87	32.1	72	31.6		
40 plus	49	19.6	24	10.5		
Total	264	100.0	228	100.0		

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF TRACKS FOLLOWED BY 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

<u>Tenth Grade</u>		<u>Academic High Schools</u>				Chi Square	p
Track	1965 No.	Entrants Percent	1966 No.	Entrants Percent			
Academic	75	40.1	84	49.1			
General	103	55.1	68	39.8			
Commercial	9	4.8	19	11.1			
Total	187	100.0	171	100.0	8.5		01
		<u>Vocational High School</u>					
Academic*	5	6.5	10	17.5			
General	72	93.5	47	82.5			
Total	77	100.0	57	100.0	4.2		05
		<u>Both Schools</u>					
Academic	80	30.3	94	41.2			
General	175	66.3	115	50.5	14.6		01
Commercial	9	3.4	19	8.3			
Total	264	100.0	228	100.0			
<u>Eleventh Grade</u>		<u>Academic High Schools</u>					
Academic	72	38.5	71	41.5			
General	90	48.1	77	45.0			
Commercial	25	13.4	23	13.5			
Total	187	100.0	171	100.0	0.31		n.s.
		<u>Vocational High School</u>					
Academic*	4	5.2	5	8.8			
General	73	94.8	52	91.2			
Total	77	100.0	57	100.0	0.5		n.s.
		<u>Both Schools</u>					
Academic	76	28.8	76	33.3			
General	163	61.7	129	56.6			
Commercial	25	9.5	23	10.1			
Total	264	100.0	228	100.0	0.63		n.s.

*This group consists of students enrolled in the Technical Electronic course.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF TRACKS FOLLOWED BY 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS
IN THE TENTH AND THE ELEVENTH GRADES

<u>Academic High Schools</u>				
Tracks	1965 Entrants		1966 Entrants	
	Tenth No.	Eleventh No.	Tenth No.	Eleventh No.
Academic	75	72	84	71
General	103	90	68	77
Commercial	9	25	19	23
Total	187	187	171	171
Chi square	8.1		2.2	
p	05		n.s.	

<u>Vocational High School</u>				
Academic	5	4	10	5
General	72	73	47	52
Total	77	77	57	57
Chi square	0		1.2	
p	n.s.		n.s.	

<u>Both Schools Combined</u>				
Academic	80	76	94	76
General	175	163	115	129
Commercial	9	25	19	23
Total	264	264	228	228
Chi square	8.1		2.9	
p	05		n.s.	

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER OF MAJOR SUBJECTS PASSED BY
1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

<u>Academic High Schools</u>								
School Year	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants			"t"	p
	No. Pass	No. Fail	% Pass	No. Pass	No. Fail	% Pass		
Total 10th	1074	484	69.2	1973	471	67.5	0.60	n.s.
Total 11th	1156	436	72.6	1027	430	70.5	0.98	n.s.
First half	603	193	75.8	531	191	73.5	1.04	n.s.
Second half	553	243	69.5	496	239	67.5	0.68	n.s.
<u>Vocational High School</u>								
Total 10th	576	79	87.9	472	45	91.3	2.58	01
Total 11th	525	130	80.2	427	53	89.0	1.76	n.s.
First half	260	66	79.8	206	32	86.5	1.83	n.s.
Second half	265	64	80.5	221	21	91.3	2.09	05
<u>Both Schools</u>								
Total 10th	1650	563	74.6	1445	516	73.7	0.02	n.s.
Total 11th	1680	566	74.8	1454	483	75.1	0.03	n.s.
First half	863	259	76.9	737	223	76.8	0.30	n.s.
Second half	818	307	76.7	717	248	74.3	0.36	n.s.

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGES OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS
PASSING AN ELEVENTH GRADE MAJOR SUBJECT: FIRST HALF

<u>English</u>	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants			Chi Square	p
	P	F	%P	P	F	%P		
Academic	130	52	71.4	120	58	67.1	0.20	n.s.
Vocational	71	6	92.2	54	1	98.2	2.40	n.s.
Both	201	58	77.6	164	59	72.3	1.60	n.s.
<u>Mathematics</u>								
Academic	45	23	66.2	51	26	65.7	0.04	n.s.
Vocational	10	1	90.1	6	3	66.6	2.93	n.s.
Both	55	24	69.6	57	29	66.3	0.12	n.s.
<u>Social Studies</u>								
Academic	119	54	68.8	118	44	72.8	0.51	n.s.
Vocational	62	11	84.9	50	6	89.3	0.28	n.s.
Both	181	65	73.6	168	50	77.1	0.75	n.s.
<u>Science</u>								
Academic	66	42	61.1	74	24	75.5	4.33	05
Vocational	11	1	91.1	6	1	85.7	4.47	05
Both	77	43	64.1	80	25	76.2	4.14	05
<u>Language</u>								
Academic only	49	15	76.6	61	11	84.7	1.72	n.s.
<u>Shop</u>								
Academic	26	5	83.9	13	5	72.2	0.53	n.s.
Vocational	116	32	78.3	92	18	83.6	0.91	n.s.
Both	142	37	79.3	105	23	82.0	0.34	n.s.
<u>Commercial</u>								
Academic only	46	22	67.6	33	13	71.7	0.17	n.s.
<u>General</u>								
Academic only	66	18	78.6	52	18	74.3	0.58	n.s.

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF THE PERCENTAGES OF 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS
PASSING AN ELEVENTH GRADE MAJOR SUBJECT: SECOND HALF

<u>English</u>	1965 Entrants			1966 Entrants			Chi Square	P
	P	F	%P	P	F	%P		
Academic	146	38	79.3	112	58	65.9	8.24	01
Vocational	63	12	84.0	55	1	98.2	8.61	01
Both	209	50	80.7	167	59	73.9	3.86	05
<u>Mathematics</u>								
Academic	45	22	67.2	51	26	66.3	0.41	n.s.
Vocational	9	2	81.8	6	2	75.0	1.08	n.s.
Both	54	24	69.2	57	28	67.1	0.12	n.s.
<u>Social Studies</u>								
Academic	134	39	77.5	113	50	69.3	2.98	n.s.
Vocational	57	17	77.0	50	6	89.3	3.38	n.s.
Both	191	56	77.3	163	56	77.4	0.42	n.s.
<u>Science</u>								
Academic	75	30	71.4	55	20	73.3	0.10	n.s.
Vocational	10	2	83.3	8	1	88.9	0.68	n.s.
Both	85	32	72.6	63	21	75.0	0.10	n.s.
<u>Language</u>								
Academic only	34	18	64.1	54	19	73.6	0.63	n.s.
<u>Shop</u>								
Academic	19	10	65.5	19	6	76.0	0.39	n.s.
Vocational	105	41	71.9	100	10	90.0	14.47	01
Both	124	51	76.0	119	16	88.1	9.53	01
<u>Commercial</u>								
Academic only	49	22	69.0	39	14	73.6	0.17	n.s.
<u>General</u>								
Academic only	59	18	76.6	45	25	64.3	3.29	n.s.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF THE HOLDING POWER OF HIGH SCHOOLS DURING THE
TENTH AND ELEVENTH GRADES FOR 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

Academic High Schools

	1965 Entrants		1966 Entrants		Chi	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	Square	p
No. Sept. 1966	398		285			
Loss during 10th ^a	117	29.4	39	13.7	23.1	01
Loss during 11th ^b	76	26.7	58	23.6	0.7	n.s.
Combined loss ^c	193	48.2	97	34.0	25.2	01
Stayins	206	51.7	188	66.0		

Vocational High School

No. Sept. 1966	119		96			
Loss in 10th	7	5.9	20	20.8	11.07	01
Loss in 11th	34	28.6	19	26.7	0.4	n.s.
Combined loss	41	34.5	39	40.6	0.7	n.s.
Stayins	78	65.5	57	59.4		

Schools Combined

No. Sept. 1966	517		381			
Loss in 10th	124	24.0	59	15.5	10.1	01
Loss in 11th	110	27.7	77	23.9	1.4	n.s.
Combined loss	234	45.1	136	35.7	8.3	01
Stayins	284	54.9	245	64.3		

Note: Chi square calculations were based on the following:

- Loss during tenth grade--number revising in school and number in school September 1966.
- Loss during eleventh grade--number revising in school at end of eleventh grade, number in school at start of eleventh grade.
- Total number leaving school in tenth and eleventh grade, number in school at end of eleventh grade, number in school September 1966.

TABLE 15

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL DURING THE TENTH GRADE AMONG
1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

	ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL				VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL			
	1965 Entrants No.	Percent	1966 Entrants No.	Percent	1965 Entrants No.	Percent	1966 Entrants No.	Percent
Employ. Cert.	9	7.8	1	2.6	1	14.3	3	15.0
Overage 17 plus	18	15.4	6	15.4	4	57.1	6	30.0
Married	1	0.8	0		0		0	
Medical	15	12.8	5	12.8	0		0	
Not found	7	6.0	4	10.3	0		2	10.0
Acad. H.S.	41	35.0	15	38.5	1	14.3	5	25.0
Vocat. H.S.	6	5.1	1	2.6	0		2	10.0
Non pub. sch.	0		0		0		0	
Out of city	18	15.4	7	17.8	1	14.3	2	10.0
Misc.	2	1.7	0		0		0	
Total	117	100.0	39	100.0	7	100.0	20	100.0

ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS COMBINED

	1965 Entrants		1966 Entrants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
<u>Discharges</u>				
Employ. Cert.	10	8.0	4	6.8
Overage 17 plus	22	17.8	12	20.3
Married	1	0.8	0	0.0
Medical discharge	15	12.1	5	8.5
Not found	7	5.6	6	10.2
 <u>Transfers</u>				
Acad. H.S.	42	33.9	20	33.9
Vocat. H.S.	6	4.9	3	5.1
Non pub. sch.	0	0.0	0	0.0
Out of city	19	15.3	9	15.2
Misc.	2	1.6	0	0.0
Total	124	100.0	59	100.0

TABLE 16

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL DURING THE ELEVENTH GRADE
AMONG 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

	ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOLS				VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL			
	'65 Entrant		'66 Entrant		'65 Entrant		'66 Entrant	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Employ.Cert.	3	4.0	2	3.4	3	8.8	2	10.5
Over Age 17	33	43.4	30	51.8	19	55.9	10	52.6
Married	2	2.6	0		0		0	
Medical	2	2.6	3	5.2	0		0	
Not Found	2	2.6	3	5.2	0		0	
Academic H.S.	19	25.0	14	24.1	10	29.5	4	21.1
Vocational H.S.	3	4.0	3	5.2	1	2.9	2	10.5
Non Publ.Sch.	1	1.3	0		0		0	
Out of City	8	10.5	1	1.7	0		1	5.3
Misc.	3	4.0	2	3.4	1	2.9	0	
Total	76	100.0	58	100.0	34	100.0	19	100.0

	BOTH SCHOOLS			
	'65 Entrant		'66 Entrant	
	No.	%	No.	%
Employ.Cert.	6	5.5	4	5.2
Over Age 17	52	47.7	40	51.9
Married	2	1.8	0	
Medical	2	1.8	3	3.9
Not Found	2	1.8	3	3.9
Academic H.S.	29	26.6	18	23.4
Vocat.H.S.	4	3.7	5	6.5
Non Publ.Sch.	8	7.5	2	2.6
Misc.	4	3.7	2	2.6
Total	109	100.0	77	100.0

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF DROPOUT RATES AMONG 1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

1965 Entrants				1966 Entrants			Chi Square	P
Total	Dropouts		Total	Dropouts				
No.	No.	%	No.	No.	%			
<u>Academic High Schools</u>								
Tenth	398	27	6.8	285	7	2.5	6.3	05
Eleventh	281	36	12.8	246	32	13.0	0.6	n.s.
<u>Vocational High School</u>								
Tenth	119	5	4.2	96	9	9.4	2.8	n.s.
Eleventh	112	22	19.6	76	12	15.8	7.3	01
<u>Both Schools Combined</u>								
Tenth	517	32	6.2	381	16	4.2	2.2	n.s.
Eleventh	393	58	14.8	322	44	13.7	0.2	n.s.

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF TRANSFERS TO OTHER HIGH SCHOOLS AMONG
1965 AND 1966 ENTRANTS

1965 Entrants				1966 Entrants			Chi Square	P
Total No.	Transfers No.	%	Total No.	Transfers No	%			
<u>Academic High Schools</u>								
Tenth	398	47	11.8	285	16	5.6	7.3	01
Eleventh	281	22	7.8	246	17	6.9	0.1	n.s.
<u>Vocational High School</u>								
Tenth	119	1	0.9	96	7	7.3	8.8	01
Eleventh	112	11	9.0	76	6	8.0	0.2	n.s.
<u>Both Schools Combined</u>								
Tenth	517	48	9.3	381	23	6.0	5.2	05
Eleventh	393	33	8.4	322	23	7.1	0.3	n.s.

TABLE 19

SUMMARY OF DATA ON STAYINS
STUDENT INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Item	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
Reading Comprehension	Average & Above 8.5		Below Average 8.5		Below Average 8.5			
Tenth Grade Achievement	Poor		Poor		Good			
Number in group	15		10		20		45	
Average Read.Score	10.2		6.2		6.0			
Percent.Majors Passed	35		20		95			
1. School term liked	Best	Least	Best	Least	Best	Least	Best	Least
ninth	5	5	4	3	7	7	16	15
tenth	2	5	4	6	7	4	13	14
eleventh	7	3	2	1	6	9	15	13
2. Ninth Grade in J.H.S.	10		6		7		23	
S.H.S.	5		4		13		22	
3. Considered dropping out:								
Yes	3		7		4		14	
No	12		3		16		31	
4. Reasons for dropping out								
pregnancy	3		3		2		8	
support family	3		1		1		5	
school failures	3		1		4		8	
lack of interest	3		4		10		17	
other reasons	3		1		3		7	
5. Amount of schooling of friends: Percentages	%		%		%			
graduating high school	70		40		65			
beyond high school	10		5		15			
dropping out of h.s.	20		55		20			
6. Change in track								
No	10		7		13		30	
Yes	5		3		7		15	
7. Value of courses for future								
Yes	8		2		14		24	
No	3		8		6		17	
Undecided	4		0		0		4	
8. Plan to drop out	0		0		0		0	
graduate from h.s.	2		4		6		12	
continue after h.s.	13		6		14		33	

STUDENT INTERVIEW RESPONSES

Item	GROUP I	GROUP II	GROUP III	Total
9. Reasons for failing major subjects:				
a. lack of interest	10	6	7	23
b. lack of ability	2	3	3	8
c. personal problems	3	1	1	5
10. Achievement this year as compared to last year:				
better	8	10	8	26
same	4	0	3	7
worse	3	0	7	10
no response	0	0	2	2
11. Who encouraged you to stay in school?				
teachers	3	0	2	5
counselors	6	1	3	10
parents	1	2	11	14
friends	2	4	1	7
nobody	3	4	3	10
12. How school can encourage you to stay				
a. give students courses they want	6	6	9	21
b. more interesting courses and teachers	3	2	1	6
c. relax rules	2	1	2	5
d. special programs	3	0	0	3
e. black history and black teachers	1	0	0	1
f. more counseling	3	2	1	6
g. nothing	0	0	4	4
13. Community action to keep students in school				
a. jobs	5	3	9	17
b. community centers	2	1	3	6
c. improve home conditions	2	2	1	5
d. nothing	4	1	1	6

TABLE 20

SUMMARY OF DATA ON STAYINS

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF GUIDANCE COUNSELORS

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Total
Number responding	15	10	20	45
1. Median number of years as counselor in school	4	5	3	
2. Median number of times counselled per year	3	3	2.5	
3. Reasons for counselling in rank order:*				
a. school work	1	1	2	
b. routine	2	2	1	
c. cutting	3	3	3	
d. discipline	4	4	4	
4. Rating of student on ten school related items:	2.7**	3.0**	2.7**	
5. Special problems of students				
a. reading	4	2	11	17
b. math	4	0	3	7
c. attendance	1	4	0	5
d. lack of parental encouragement	0	4	3	7
e. immaturity	3	0	1	4
f. others	3	0	0	3
6. Reasons for staying in school				
a. parents	5	2	1	8
b. diploma	6	3	17	26
c. don't know	3	0	2	5
d. no response	1	5	0	6
7. Predicted future schooling				
a. drop out	5	5	2	12
b. graduation from h.s.	5	3	7	15
c. continue after h.s.	5	2	11	18

* The counselors appeared to have little or no information about the background or personal problems of these students.

** Students were rated on a five point scale where (1) was excellent, (2) good, (3) fair, (4) poor, (5) very poor and (6) no information. The above are an average of the ten ratings. However, more than a third of the items were not rated or rated (0) because the counselor lacked information about the student's background.

TABLE 21

SUMMARY OF DATA ON STAYINS

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Total
Number responding	28	18	40	86
Median number of years of teaching	4	1.5	5	
1. Taught the student previously	14	7	17	38
Rating of present as compared to previous performance	2.5*	2.0*	2.0*	
2. Rating of student for ten school related items	2.5**	2.7**	2.3**	
3. Prediction of schooling:				
a. dropout before graduation	2	3	2	7
b. graduation from high school	8	5	10	23
c. continued schooling after h.s.	2	0	5	7
d. disagreed on dropouts	2	1	3	6
4. Special assistance given students				
a. much	1	0	0	1
b. little	11	7	8	26
c. none	13	7	26	46
d. no response	3	4	6	13
5. Factors keeping student in school				
a. desire for further education	12	2	5	19
b. diploma	4	10	20	34
c. friends	0	2	0	2
d. parents	0	0	2	2
e. don't know	7	2	3	12
f. no response	5	2	8	15
6. Reasons for dropouts				
a. lack of parental interest	1	0	0	1
b. lack of interest in school	4	3	15	22
c. lack of ability	4	1	4	9
d. constant failure, frustration	7	7	6	20
e. family problems	9	4	8	21
f. friends	2	1	1	4
g. no response	5	1	6	12

*The following rating scale was employed: (1) considerably better; (2) somewhat better; (3) about the same; (4) somewhat below and; (5) considerably below.

**The same rating scale was employed for comparing the student with his classmates.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

(CONTINUED)

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Total
7. Suggestions for keeping students in school				
a. preparation for jobs	7	3	5	15
b. more guidance	3	1	7	11
c. more and better courses and curriculum	5	16	16	37
d. nothing	0	1	2	3
e. no response	4	3	6	13

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF DROPOUTS AMONG THREE GROUPS OF 1965 ENTRANTS
DURING THE ELEVENTH GRADE

Group	Number of Stayins	Dropouts	Percent Dropouts	Chi Square	p
I	27	2	7.0		
II	27	8	22.9		
III	71	16	18.5	0.25	n.s.

APPENDIX B

January 15, 1968

Project: Grade Reorganization Preparatory To The Establishment Of The
Four Year Comprehensive High School
1967-68 Follow-Up Study

To: Principals of Participating High Schools
From: Dr. Edward Frankel, Project Director

Dear

The New York City Board of Education has contracted with the Center for Urban Education to conduct a follow-up study of the Ninth Grade Transfer Program which is a step toward the establishment of the Four Year Comprehensive High School. Dr. Nathan Brown, Executive Deputy Superintendent, has given authorization for this evaluation.

This is the third year of evaluation of the transfer program. The purpose of the present study is to determine if there are any long range effects of the transfer plan on student achievement, behavior or attitudes toward school. The populations for the study are students who entered the high school as ninth graders in September 1965 from segregated, decapitated junior high schools. Comparisons will be made with ethnically similar students who came to the high school as tenth graders in September 1966. These two groups consist largely of the students included in last year's study.

The current study will attempt to find answers to the following questions:

1. What has been the effect of the transfer plan on the drop-out rate among these two groups of students?
2. What effect has the plan had on the academic performance of these students?
3. What are some of the characteristics of disadvantaged students who remain in school?

The following data will be required to answer these questions:

1. Attendance and transfer records.
2. Cumulative student records of academic achievement and courses being studied.
3. Questionnaire and interview responses with samples of students, teachers, guidance counselors and administrators.

These data will be collected by our own clerical aides in a manner that will not interfere with the normal activities of the school. We know from past experiences that our research efforts are most fruitful and meaningful to all concerned when they are conducted in a friendly and cooperative spirit.

We, therefore, turn to you and your staff for research suggestions since you are so much closer to these students and their problems and are probably more aware of and sensitive to areas in need of research than we may be. For these reasons, we are launching this year's follow-up study by suggesting a conference with you and staff members who have been in constant contact with these disadvantaged students.

In preparation for this meeting, a series of questions have been posed which are intended to guide but not limit discussion. The questions suggest areas which might be profitably reviewed. Last year's study has been sent to you and I hope you have had the opportunity to peruse it.

We would like to meet with you at your earliest convenience and begin this follow-up study as soon as possible. I will call you in a few days after you receive this letter to arrange for a mutually convenient meeting time. I look forward to renewing our relationship.

If you wish to communicate with me, please do so at Hunter College in the Bronx, Department of Education, Bedford Park Boulevard West, Bronx, New York, 10468, telephone 212-WE 3-6000 Ext. 632.

Cordially,

Edward Frankel
Project Director

Center For Urban Education

Project: Grade Reorganization Preparatory To The Establishment Of The
Four Year Comprehensive High School: 1967-68 Follow-Up Study

Project Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

January 15, 1968

Conference Schedule

School..... Principal.....

Date.....Other Participants.....

.....
It is suggested as far as possible that the discussion focus on the current school year, 1967-68 and on the disadvantaged students who entered the school as ninth graders in September 1965 from segregated, truncated junior high schools.

- I. In general, how does the project students who entered the school as ninth graders in September 1965 differ from other third year groups with respect to:
 - a. the administrative changes effected in order to accommodate them
 - b. curriculum modifications needed for their education
 - c. guidance services
 - d. attitude toward school as expressed by attendance, lateness and cutting, general deportment in and around the school and participation in extra-curricular activities.
- II. What major changes were made in the school this year for these students?
- III. What are the special needs of these students which the school has not been able to provide and what are your recommendations regarding these needs?
- IV. What aspects of the program do you think need to be researched?
- V. What suggestions do you have as to how these problems should be evaluated?

Please return to Dr. Edward Frankel - Hunter College in the Bronx
Bedford Park Blvd. W., Bronx, New York 10468

B4



February 23, 1968

Project: High School Follow-Up Study - Grade Reorganization

To: Principals of Participating High Schools

From: Dr. Edward Frankel, Project Director

Dear

It was my pleasure to confer with you recently regarding the High School Follow-Up Study, seeking to determine the possible effects of the grade reorganization plan upon ninth graders who entered the high school in September 1965 from segregated decapitated junior high schools located in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods.

As a guide to our discussion, I left with you a copy of a "Conference Schedule". For purposes of accurate evaluation, I would appreciate having it completed and returned to me at your earliest convenience. My address is:

Hunter College in the Bronx
Bedford Park Blvd. W.
Bronx, New York 10468

To facilitate this request, I am enclosing two additional copies of this form for your convenience.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to you and your staff for the courtesy and cooperation they have extended to us in collecting the data on the two groups to be studied, the 1965 ninth grade entrants and their 1966 tenth grade copeers.

We would like to begin collecting data for the second problem in our study-- what is keeping these youngsters in school-- that is, a positive approach focused on the "stay-ins". We think we can find answers by interviewing the guidance counselors, the teachers and the students themselves.

I will communicate with you very soon to make arrangements with the guidance counselors for the collection of such data and I hope that you will permit us to do so. As in the past, we will be as unobtrusive as possible and do this work at the convenience of your staff.

Again, thank you for making this study so pleasant by your kindness and cooperation.

Cordially,

Edward Frankel
Project Director

B5

Center For Urban Education
High School Follow-Up Study
1967-68

March 1968

Evaluation Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

Guidance Counselor of Eleventh Grade Students

School _____ Name of Counselor _____

In September 1965, a substantial number of ninth grade students were admitted to this high school from segregated, decapitated junior high schools. Many of these entering students were economically disadvantaged and educationally retarded. Federal funds were obtained to provide these youngsters with compensatory educational services designed to stimulate their motivation to learn and to improve their scholastic status.

The Center For Urban Education was authorized by the Board of Education to evaluate this program in 1965-66 and in 1966-67. The current evaluation is a follow-up study to determine the possible long range effects of this program on those ninth graders who entered the school in September 1965 and are still in the school. The purpose is to find out what keeps youngsters in school, particularly those who might be expected to drop out.

We plan to interview a sample of these "stay-ins" and also to get some information about them from their guidance counselors and their current major subject teachers. We are asking you to help us in this task. You are the guidance counselor for the following students:

- | | |
|----|----|
| 1. | 4. |
| 2. | 5. |
| 3. | 6. |

Will you please do the following:

1. Arrange an interview for us with these students in your office.

Date _____ Time _____

2. Complete a "Guidance Counselor" Questionnaire for each of them.
3. Distribute a "Classroom Teachers" Questionnaire to all the major subject teachers of each one of these students.
4. Collect the completed questionnaires from the teachers and together with your completed questionnaires, mail them no later than _____ to:

Dr. Edward Frankel, Hunter College in the Bronx
Bedford Park Blvd. West, Bronx, New York, 10468

Thank you for your cooperation.

Center For Urban Education
High School Follow-Up Study: 1967-68

Evaluation Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

March 1968

Student Interview Schedule

High School _____ Student _____ Off. Class _____

Interviewed by _____ Date _____ Counselor _____ Category _____

In September 1965, you and your junior high school classmates came to this high school as ninth graders. This is your third year in this school. Some of your friends and former classmates have dropped out of school, but you have not. We would like to know why you are still in school. Only you can answer this question. For that reason, an interview with you has been arranged. We would like you to answer the questions which follow as frankly as possible. Your name and answers will be held in strictest confidence. Only the person you speak with will know who you are. We would appreciate your help. Thank you.

.....

1. This is your third year in this high school. Check the year you:
 a. liked best ninth tenth eleventh
 Why?
 b. liked least ninth tenth eleventh
 Why?
2. Is it better to be a ninth grader in junior or senior high school
 Why?
3. Did you ever seriously think of dropping out of school? yes ... no ...
 If yes, when Why?.....
4. Some of your friends or former classmates may have dropped out of school.
 a. Do you know why?
 b. What are they doing now?
 c. How do they feel about having dropped out?
 d. If one of your best friends told you that he wanted to drop out, what
 would you tell him (her)?
5. How much schooling will most of your friends complete?
6. What changes, if any, have you made in the kinds of subjects you are
 studying?
 When?..... Why?.....
7. To what extent are the courses you are now taking going to prepare you
 for what you plan to do in the future?

Student Interview Schedule

8. Do you plan to (a) leave school before graduation _____
(b) be graduated from school _____
(c) continue school after graduation _____

If your answer to (c) is yes, what kind of school.....

9. What major subjects did you fail last year.....

Why do you think you failed them?

10. How are you doing this year as compared to last year at school?.....

If there is a difference, how do you account for it?

11. Was there anybody or anything in school that encouraged you to stay in school?

Explain.

12. What do you think the school can do to make more young people want to stay?

13. What do you think can be done outside the school to make more youngsters want to stay in school?

Center For Urban Education
High School Follow-Up Study

Evaluation Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

March 1968

Guidance Counselor of Eleventh Grade Students

In September 1965, a substantial number of ninth grade students were admitted to this high school from segregated junior high schools that had lost their ninth grade. Most of these schools were located in ghetto areas and many of these entering students were educationally disadvantaged. Federal funds were obtained to provide these youngsters with compensatory educational services to increase their motivation to learn and to improve their educational status.

The Center For Urban Education was authorized by the Board of Education to evaluate this program in 1965-66 and in 1966-67. The current study is a follow-up evaluation of the transfer program to determine possible long range effects on participating students who have been in the school for at least two years. The focus is on the September 1965 disadvantaged ninth graders who are still in school. The purpose of the study is to find out what is keeping them in school.

We realize that the question being asked is extremely complex and defies a simple answer. It probably varies with the individual students, his background, school experience, aspirations, friends and the like. Nevertheless, we think it important to find out what the school is doing for them or what the students find in the school that keeps them from dropping out. A preliminary survey indicates that a considerable number of students who would be expected to drop out are still in school.

We would like to make contact with these "stay-ins" and we would like your assistance by arranging interviews with specific students in this category. In addition, we would like you to evaluate these students by completing a questionnaire. We would also like to have one or two of his teachers tell us about these students by completing a questionnaire and by an interview.

Center For Urban Education
High School Follow-Up Study: 1967-68

Evaluation Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

March 1968

Guidance Counselor of Eleventh Grade Student

School _____ Name of Counselor _____ Date _____

Name of Student _____ Off. Class _____

1. How long have you been a guidance counselor? _____ in this school? _____
2. How many times have you counselled this student?
in the ninth grade _____ tenth grade _____ eleventh grade _____
3. What were the reasons for counselling this student? Indicate frequency using (1) for most often, (2) for next most often and so forth

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Reason</u>
_____	a. routine interview	_____	i. financial problems
_____	b. attendance	_____	j. home conditions
_____	c. lateness	_____	k. problems with peers
_____	d. cutting	_____	l. problems with parents
_____	e. school work	_____	m. problems with opposite sex
_____	f. health problems	_____	n. incidents in or around school
_____	g. disciplinary problems	_____	o. none of these
_____	h. emotional problems	_____	p. others (_____)

Comment:

4. From your knowledge of this student, how would you rate him (her) with respect to the following items, using the scale given below:

excellent	good	fair	poor	very poor	no information
1	2	3	4	5	0

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Item</u>
_____	a. native ability	_____	g. relationship with parents
_____	b. motivation for school	_____	h. relationship with peers
_____	c. parental educational achievement	_____	i. relationship with opposite sex
_____	d. parental economic status	_____	j. participation in school student government
_____	e. parental attitude toward school	_____	athletics
_____	f. family or marital organization	_____	social functions
		_____	clubs and squads

Comment:

Guidance Counselor of Eleventh Year Students

5. List the special problems that this student has had which interfere with his (her) schooling?
6. What special talents, interests or abilities has this student exhibited?
7. What special assistance has this student received that is sustaining him (her) in school?
8. Why do you think this student has remained in school?
9. Do you believe this student will
 - a. drop out before graduation? yes__ no__ Why?
 - b. continue and be graduated? yes__ no__ Why?
 - c. continue schooling beyond graduation? yes__ no__ Why?
10. Is there anything not being done that should be done to help this student in school?
11. Is there anything else that we ought to know about this student in relation to school?

B11

Center For Urban Education
High School Follow-Up Study
1967-68

March 1968

Evaluation Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

Classroom Teachers of Eleventh Grade Students

In September 1965, a substantial number of ninth graders were admitted to this high school from segregated junior high schools that had lost their ninth grade. Many of these schools were located in ghetto areas and many of the entering students were educationally disadvantaged. Federal funds were obtained to provide these students with compensatory educational services.

The Board of Education authorized the Center For Urban Education to evaluate this program in 1965-66 and in 1966-67, the first two years. The current evaluation is a follow-up study of this program in its third year to determine the possible long range effects on those disadvantaged youngsters who entered the school in the ninth grade in September 1965 and are still in school.

The purpose of this study is to find out why potential dropouts among these students are still in school. A sample of "stay-ins" has been selected whom we plan to interview and also to have their guidance counselor fill out a questionnaire. In addition, we would like to get the reactions of the classroom teachers of these students to a questionnaire. These will be given to you by the guidance counselor of the student whom we have selected and whom you are currently teaching. Please fill these out at your earliest convenience and return them to the guidance counselor from whom you receive them.

We feel that your responses to the questionnaire will give us an important dimension in our study which we cannot obtain from any other source. Should you wish to confer with us about the student or the questionnaire, please inform the guidance counselor and we shall make every effort to see you at your convenience.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Center For Urban Education
High School Follow-Up Study: 1967-68

Evaluation Director: Dr. Edward Frankel

March 1968

Classroom Teachers Questionnaire

School _____ Name of Teacher _____ Date _____
License _____ Date _____ Subject taught _____ How long in this school _____
Name of Student _____ Off. Class _____ Subject Class _____

1. Have you taught this student previously? yes___ no___
If yes, when _____ what subject _____
Using the scale below, compare the present performance of this student
with that previously observed: Circle your choice.

Considerably better	Somewhat better	About the same	Somewhat below	Considerably below
------------------------	--------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

2. Compare this student with his classmates using the numbers in the
rating scale given above:

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Item</u>
_____	a. basic ability	_____	g. attitude toward school
_____	b. attendance	_____	h. attitude toward teacher
_____	c. cutting	_____	i. attitude toward peers
_____	d. discipline	_____	j. attitude toward self
_____	e. participation in class	_____	k. other ()
_____	f. homework and assignments		

3. Do you believe this student will: Yes No (check one)
- | | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| (a) drop out before graduation | _____ | _____ |
| (b) will be graduated | _____ | _____ |
| (c) will continue schooling after graduation | _____ | _____ |
4. What special assistance has this student received from
- (a) you _____
- (b) from other sources _____
5. What special assistance does this student require to stay in school?
6. What do you think is keeping this student in school?
7. Have you had contact with this student outside of your subject class?
Yes___ No___
If yes, in what connection or activities?
8. Why do you think students drop out of school?
9. What do you think can be done to keep them in school?

STUDENT DATA CARD

COUNSELOR_____

NAME OF STUDENT _____ CLASS _____ DATE _____

Entered H.S. _____ 9/65 _____ 9/66 from JHS _____ Boro _____ RECORDER _____

S T A	STUDENT NO.		H. S.	S E X	E T H	METROPOLITAN READING										ABSENCE					TRACK						
						Oct. 65	Oct. 66	May 67	65-66	66-67	1/68	6/68	6/66	6/67	6/68												
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28

ENGLISH			MATHEMATICS			SOC/STUD			SCIENCE			L N G	S P C H	A R T	M U S	SHOP			C O M M	G E N	TOTAL			TOTAL			TOTAL				
Aca	Gen	Rem	Aca	Gen	Rem	Reg	Gen	Reg	Gen	B	G					E	M	U			S	B	G	E	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48			69	70			73	74			77	78
																				1/68				1/67				1/66			
																				6/68				6/67				6/66			
49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68			71	72			75	76			79	80

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL PROFILES

The information for the profiles of the four high schools used in this study was derived from several sources. The general descriptions of the schools were provided by the principals and their administrators through interviews and also from brochures published by the schools. The ethnic and population data were taken from official Board of Education records, such as the annual reports of the Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics, the School Planning and Research Division, and the Bureau of Attendance.

Profile of High School "E"

High School "E" is located in a lower middle class residential community consisting of a mixture of one and two family private houses, apartment houses, and housing projects. Until recently, the residents were mostly Italian and Jewish families; however, there has been a steady influx of Negro and Puerto Rican families attracted by a private interracial housing development and low and middle income housing projects. The school population has reflected the change. Over the past five years, the Negro school population increased from 980 (24 per cent) to 1,788 (38 per cent), Puerto Ricans increased from 200 (5 per cent) to 411 (9 per cent), while the percentages of others decreased from 77 to 53. Moreover, the total number of students in the school rose from 4,180 in 1963 to 4,650 in 1967.

The entering ninth grade class of September 1965 consisted of about 400 students, half of whom were white, mostly parochial school graduates, and the other half of whom were Negro and Puerto Rican students from segregated and truncated junior high schools located outside the school district. The out-of-school district students came largely from four segregated junior high schools through the free choice transfer plan.

For the 1965-66 study, a sample of 140 students from these segregated truncated high schools was selected for the study.

The sample of 134 1966 tenth grade entrants was selected from the entering tenth grade class of 1,740 students, of whom approximately half were Negro or Puerto Rican and half white. These students were graduates of junior high schools located within the school district. Two of these feeder junior high schools were segregated and they were the chief source of the 1966 tenth grade sample.

Profile of High School "C"

High School "C" is located in a stable, predominantly white Catholic, lower middle class neighborhood consisting largely of small private dwellings. For the most part, the parents are employed in private industry

and in the building trades. In 1964 in a school population of 2,800, 96 per cent were white or other. In 1965 the school zone was extended to include noncontiguous disadvantaged areas. Again, in 1966, still other disadvantaged areas were added to the school zone. By 1967, the school housed 4,360 students but the percentage of Others had declined to 64 per cent. Correspondingly, the Puerto Rican population increased from 1 to 3 per cent while the Negro population rose from 3 to 33 per cent.

The September 1965 ninth grade entering class consisted of approximately 600 students. About 200 of these came from the truncated, segregated junior high schools located in the noncontiguous ghetto areas. Of these 123 selected for the 1965-66 study, 10 per cent were Puerto Rican and 90 per cent were Negro.

The tenth grade 1966 sample of 40 students was selected from an entering class of over 1,300. The majority of the sample students was drawn from those who had attended two segregated junior high schools.

Profile of High School "T"

High School "T" is an academic high school located in a stable middle class residential area composed of over 90 per cent white, Jewish middle class families. Until 1964, the school was over 95 per cent white. By 1967 the white population declined from 4,600 to 3,200, a decrease of 20 per cent, whereas the percentages of Puerto Rican students increased from 39 (0.8 per cent) to 220 (5 per cent). The Negro pupil population grew from 102 (2 per cent) to 688 (17 per cent) during this period.

The September 1965 ninth grade entering class was composed of 700 students, 50 per cent Negro or Puerto Rican and 50 per cent white or other.

The 1965 ninth grade sample consisted of 157 students, over 90 per cent of whom came from the two truncated segregated junior high schools included in the school district when it was rezoned.

The 1966 tenth grade sample used in the 1966-67 study contained only 23 students from segregated disadvantaged junior high schools. The small number was occasioned by the fact that there were so few junior high schools with disadvantaged tenth graders who came to this school.

Profile of High School "G"

High School "G" is an all boys vocational and technical high school situated in downtown Brooklyn. As a multi-trade school it offers vocational courses in clock and watch repair, dental laboratory processing, jewelry mechanics, optical mechanics, electrical installation, cabinet making, radio and electronics.

Over the past five years, there have been minor changes in the ethnic composition of the school, resulting in a slight increase in the percentages of Puerto Rican and Negro students. In 1963, the school was 17 per cent Puerto Rican, 33 per cent Negro and 50 per cent others. Five years later, the distribution was 22, 40 and 38 per cent respectively. The total school population was fairly constant; it fluctuated around the 2,000 mark.

The school was not part of the 1965-66 study. The 1965 ninth grade sample was selected ex post facto from among the 460 students who had entered the school the previous September (1965) from segregated, truncated junior high schools. This sample contained 119 students.

The 1966 tenth grade sample consisted of 65 students selected from the September 1966 tenth grade class entering the school from segregated junior high schools throughout the city.

APPENDIX D

Staff List

Dr. Edward Frankel, Evaluation Director
Associate Professor of Education and
Director of Institutional Research
Lehman College of the City University of New York

Dr. Perry Kalick, Assistant Evaluation Director
Assistant Professor of Education
Lehman College of the City University of New York

Dr. Bernard Flicker
Assistant Professor of Education
Lehman College of the City University of New York